| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary  | Application No.                  | Applicant(s)                    |
|---|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|   | 10/588,627                       | EGGINK ET AL.                   |
|   | Examiner                         | Art Unit                        |
|   | ANDREW D. KOSAR                  | 1654                            |
| All Participants: Status of Application: after restriction  |                                  |                                 |
| (1) <u>ANDREW D. KOSAR</u> .  | (3)                              |                                 |
| (2) <u>Rodney Fuller</u> .  | (4)                              |                                 |
| Date of Interview: 21 May 2010  | Time: <u>15:00</u>               |                                 |
| Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:  |                                  |                                 |
| Part I.   |                                  |                                 |
| Rejection(s) discussed: potential 112   |                                  |                                 |
| Claims discussed: all, in general   |                                  |                                 |
| Prior art documents discussed: n/a  |                                  |                                 |
| Part II.  |                                  |                                 |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:   |                                  |                                 |
| Discussed proposed amendments that would place the application in condition for allowance, as reflected in the attached Examiner's Amendment. Claims 5-8 would be cancelled as not being of an overlapping scope (being drawn to different peptides), claims 11 would also be cancelled, as it is drawn to peptides other than those of claim 1. Claim 10 has been amended to an independent claim and claim 9 is cancelled, being broader in scope than the peptides of claim 1, and to preclude potential art and/or 112 rejections. Claims 12 and 13 would be amended to more accurately represent the invention being a peptide having more than one of the sequences of claim 1, including branched species. Claims 26-31 and 33-37 would be cancelled to preclude potential 112 and/or art rejections. Applicant would consider DIV/CON to cancelled subject matter, and agreed to cancel the claims to expedite prosecution and obtain the indicated allowable subject matter. Agreement was reached on the proposed amendments, placing the application in condition for allowance. |                                  |                                 |
| Part III.   |                                  |                                 |
| <ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>  |                                  |                                 |
| /Andrew D Kosar/<br>Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1654<br>(A   | pplicant/Applicant's Representat | ive Signature – if appropriate) |